

BEFORE THE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

STATE OF WASHINGTON

GEANENE LUBINSKI,

Appellant,

v.

COLUMBIA BASIN COLLEGE,

Respondent.

Case No. ALLO-01-0015

ORDER OF THE BOARD FOLLOWING  
HEARING ON EXCEPTIONS TO THE  
DETERMINATION OF THE DIRECTOR

**Hearing on Exceptions.** This appeal came on for hearing before the Personnel Appeals Board, GERALD L. MORGEN, Vice Chair, and LEANA D. LAMB, Member, on Appellant's exceptions to the director's determination dated May 3, 2001. The hearing was held in the Administration Building of the Columbia Basin College, Pasco, Washington. WALTER T. HUBBARD, Chair, did not participate in the hearing or in the decision in this matter.

**Appearances.** Appellant Geanene Lubinski was present and was represented by Leslie Liddle, Employee Relations Specialist for the Washington Public Employees Association. Ruben Lemos, Associate Dean of Human Resources, represented Respondent Columbia Basin College.

**Background.** Appellant submitted a Position Questionnaire (PQ) requesting that her position as an Administrative Assistant A be reallocated to the class of Program Manager. Ruben Lemos conducted a position audit and by letter dated January 5, 2001, notified Appellant that her position was correctly allocated to the class of Administrative Assistant A. By letter dated January 10, 2001, Appellant appealed this determination to the director of the Department of Personnel. On April 5,

1 2001, Tammy C. Tee, Human Resource Consultant, conducted a telephonic verification interview.  
2 By letter dated June 5, 2001, Appellant was informed of Ms. Tee's determination that her position  
3 was properly allocated. On May 30, 2001, Appellant filed exceptions to the determination of the  
4 Department of Personnel.

5  
6 Appellant works at the Richland Campus of the Columbia Basin College in the Student Services  
7 Department. Appellant coordinates various functions within Student Services and provides direct  
8 administrative support to her supervisor, the director of Student Services. She supervises five  
9 hourly employees and two students who perform general office support work within the department.  
10 Appellant's supervisor, Lon Kongsle, is a fulltime faculty counselor, who during the time period  
11 pertinent to this appeal, acted as the Director of Student Services in addition to his full-time  
12 counseling duties.

13  
14 **Summary of Appellant's Argument.** Appellant disagrees with the designee's determination that  
15 she does not perform work in support of a major administrative department or program. Appellant  
16 contends that she exercises total responsibility for the Student Services operations and only  
17 provides minimal support services to her supervisor in that she maintains his calendar. Appellant  
18 contends that the Richland Campus is a complex organizational unit because it has both academic  
19 and student services components along with various other programs vocational in nature. Appellant  
20 contends that she is responsible for hiring and training staff and for making any necessary  
21 recommendations to terminate an employee. Appellant asserts that the staff she supervises  
22 performs complex functions and possesses the skills to provide all types of services rather than just  
23 general functions. Appellant argues that she has an active role in the department's budget by  
24 maintaining the necessary fiscal records, compiling the information and by assisting the director in  
25 planning, monitoring, making projections and preparing budget reports.

1 **Summary of Respondent's Argument.** Respondent agrees that Appellant's position requires that  
2 she be very multitasked but disagrees that Appellant's level of functioning is at a program manager  
3 level. Respondent argues that the Dean of Student Services is ultimately responsible for the  
4 department and that the director of Student Services is responsible for the budget and all student  
5 services provided. Respondent disagrees that the Richland Campus is a major administrative  
6 department, operating unit or program. Respondent argues that Appellant's position is  
7 appropriately allocated at the Administrative Assistant A level.

8  
9 **Primary Issue.** Whether the director's determination that Appellant's position is properly allocated  
10 to the Administrative Assistant A classification should be affirmed.

11  
12 **Relevant Classifications.** Administrative Assistant A, class code 2045; Program Manager A, class  
13 code 2015.

14  
15 **Decision of the Board.** The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best  
16 describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a  
17 measurement of the volume of work performed, nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that  
18 work is performed. Also, a position review is not a comparison of work performed by employees in  
19 similar positions. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular  
20 position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the  
21 class that best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. Liddle-Stamper v.  
22 Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

23  
24 Appellant contends that she provides support to the Student Services program. A Program Manager  
25 is defined as follows:

1 Supervise a division of a major administrative department, operating unit or  
2 program undertaking relieving the senior official of operating and administrative  
3 detail. Plan, coordinate and implement all functions required by the activity.

4 Appellant performs a myriad of duties, both supervisory and administrative in nature, in support of  
5 the Student Services department. She does not supervise a division, operating unit or program as  
6 intended by the Program Manager definition. Furthermore, ultimate responsibility for the Student  
7 Services department rests with Director of Student Services, Appellant's direct supervisor.  
8 Appellant's duties and responsibilities alleviate her supervisor from overseeing the day-to-day  
9 functions of the department, however, Appellant's supervisor reports to the Dean of Student  
10 Services, who possesses ultimate responsibility for the department. Appellant is not responsible for  
11 directly advising or assisting the Dean regarding matters pertaining to the program.

12 The specification for the class of Program Manager A indicates that the incumbent:

13  
14 Administers, supervises, directs and advises on activities involved in providing an  
15 essential management service within the institution. They are responsible for  
16 advising and assisting, with minimal direction, the senior official and other  
administrators in the organization on matters pertaining to the program. ...

17 Positions in this class involve a wide scope of complex duties and responsibilities  
18 in the management of a program which may involve a combination of two or  
19 more of the following services: Project management; funds management, . . .  
20 student services administration ... Program Managers exercise independent  
21 judgment, and have been delegated decision-making authority. Program  
managers at the "A" level are typically first-line supervisors, and are  
characterized by their total responsibility for a program or management services  
to an administrative supervisor.

22  
23 Appellant's role is fundamental in coordinating the overall administrative support functions for the  
24 department. She supervises employees, exercises limited authority over purchases up to \$150, and  
25 manages \$13,550 allocated for salaries, goods and services. Appellant's direct supervisor signs all  
26 purchase requisitions that are eventually sent to the Dean for approval. Appellant has an active role

1 in preparing the department's budget: she monitors and gathers data for expenditures; she  
2 maintains the financial records; and she works closely with her supervisor to prepare the budget.  
3 However, her supervisor finalizes the budget and forwards it to the Dean who is responsible for  
4 final review and approval. Appellant does have decision-making authority to hire new employees  
5 and for small purchases, however, Appellant does not have decision-making authority over the  
6 management of the Student Services department or any decisions that would impact the program.  
7 Appellant lacks the total program responsibility necessary for allocation to the Program Manager A  
8 classification. Furthermore, Appellant does not work with a combination of two or more program  
9 services.

10  
11 Appellant's duties and responsibilities also include ensuring that instructors receive clerical  
12 assistance, message services, audio visual aids and materials and instruction. Appellant provides  
13 information regarding admissions and registration to the public; performs and supervises cashiering  
14 duties; processes book and supply sales; and picks up and delivers books between the Pasco  
15 bookstore and the Richland Campus.

16  
17 The Basic Function of an Administrative Assistant A is to:

18  
19 Provide staff support to the chief administrator or head of a major organizational  
20 unit such as a school, college or major academic or administrative department.  
21 Represent the administrator and/or unit's goals and interests and provide and/or  
22 coordinate functions such as budget and space management/analysis, grant and  
23 contract proposal preparation, records management, and student services and/or  
24 personnel administration.

25 Typical work includes preparing reports and budgets; monitoring and controlling budget status and  
26 expenditures; records maintenance and equipment inventory; and coordinating and compiling  
preparation of documents related to purchases, payroll, and the budget.

1  
2 After reviewing Appellant's Position Questionnaire, we conclude that Appellant's overall duties  
3 and responsibilities are best described by the Administrative Assistant A classification.

4  
5 **Conclusion.** The appeal on exceptions by Appellant should be denied and the Director's  
6 determination dated May 3, 2001, should be affirmed and adopted.

7  
8 **ORDER**

9 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Geanene  
10 Lubinski is denied and the attached Director's determination dated May 3, 2001, is affirmed and  
11 adopted.

12  
13 DATED this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2001.

14 WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

15  
16 \_\_\_\_\_  
Gerald L. Morgen, Vice Chair

17  
18 \_\_\_\_\_  
Leana D. Lamb, Member